

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCY
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/735,980	12/15/2003	Ramadas Lakshmikanth Pai	15137US02	4226	
23446	7590 08/17/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD			FRANKLIN, RICHARD B		
500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60661			2181		
			DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/735,980	PAI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Richard Franklin	2181	

	Richard Franklin	2181					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 09 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, af stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing days.	of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NC		ecause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>	: The 35 USC 112 2 <sup>nd</sup> Paragraph I	Rejections of claims 1	-8 and 17.				
<ul> <li>7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro         The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ul>		ill be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: 1517.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, by because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N id sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ned.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.		FRITZFLEMIN	iG				
	S	UPERVISORY PATENT TECHNOLOGY CENT					

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendment is entered on the condition that the amendment to claim 17, only further defines "the compressed data buffer." The Examiner had previously, in the Final Office Action, stated that "the first memory" was interpreted to refer to the "compressed data buffer" that had been previously recited in the claim. Because Applicant has submitted no clarifying remarks for the amendment and has not argued the interpretation of the Examiner, "a first memory" of current claim 17 is interpreted to further define the "compressed data buffer." If the interpretation is incorrect, Applicant should address such inaccuracies in a further amendment. As per applicants remarks to the art rejection of the claims, applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been modivated to modify Stohs in view of Tanaka because the solution of Tanaka introduces additional requirements that would increase the size of the system. However, the claim does not require a size limitation of the system, and therefore Applicants arguments are deemed to be non-persuasive.